

the wealthiest Americans. They want to take it all away.

I am not doing that. I am saying, keep \$600 billion. Just don't take \$688.9 billion.

Look, I have been here a long while. It is fascinating to me. I keep getting the same lesson taught to me. The American people are always way ahead of us. The \$87 billion in additional revenue we are seeking with this amendment is less than eight-tenths of 1 percent of our \$11 trillion economy.

I challenge any of my colleagues to tell me they honestly believe this is going to slow up this jobless recovery. It won't even have any affect until the recovery is a year and a half underway. Fewer than 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans will even be affected by this change. Keep in mind, this is like my saying to my grandchildren—I have three granddaughters—we are going to go to the ice cream store and, look, pop only has 12 bucks with him. I can only afford three double-dip ice cream cones. I can't afford three triple-dip ice cream cones. So you are only going to get two dips instead of three. It is not like saying: Look, kids, I was going to feed you tonight but you are not going to get to eat. We were going to have hamburgers and french fries and a salad, but all I am going to give you is a salad. Or you can't eat at all. We are not taking away anything. We are just not giving as much.

Again, small business, fewer than 2 percent of small businesses, that is, sole proprietors, the real mom-and-pop small businesses, will even be affected by this. Ninety-eight percent will not be affected.

This is a small, tiny nick in a huge tax cut. It asks for a contribution from those who have the clearest ability to contribute—not because we want to punish them. This isn't about being punitive. It is because they have the clearest capability.

Again, take my granddaughters out. Assume my son was not doing better than I am—he is but assume he isn't—and the kids want an ice cream cone. Why shouldn't pop pay? I have the money to pay for it. It is not going to affect me at all. But if all he had in his whole pocket was 10 bucks for the week, why should he pay when I have 300 bucks in my pocket? This just isn't fair.

Again, I repeat, I don't know any wealthy Americans making \$1 million a year who say, look, I don't want to do this. It is going to hurt me. I am not going to be able to make it. This is going to put a crimp in my style.

Again, let me give you a number. If you have an income of \$400,000 a year—remember, the average income of the people in this bracket is almost a million dollars, 980-some-thousand dollars a year. Let's just put that in perspective. If, in fact, you are making \$400,000 a year and your tax rate is going to go, from 2005 to 2010, back up from 35 to 38.2, what is the effect on your pocket? You pay the difference between 312,

which gets you into the category, and 400, at a higher rate. That is \$68,000, roughly. You have to get to 380-something. How much more taxes does it mean that you pay? Roughly, \$2,100 more a year.

Are you telling me the people making \$400,000 a year are not willing to kick in \$2,100 a year for 5 years beginning in the year 2005—or for 6 years beginning in 2005 to win the peace in Iraq? Boy, do we underestimate these folks. These are loyal, patriotic Americans. They would be ready to do a lot more if we needed them to do it. But \$2,100, if you make a million dollars? I asked my staff to do a back-of-the-envelope calculation. Let's say the poor guy who has no deductions—"poor" guy—the rookie who signs a contract for \$1.150 million. Guess what. After standard deductions because of the loopholes and the other things the wealthiest among us in this country have, he has a real taxable income of a million dollars. How much more is he going to have to pay? Roughly \$22,000. That is going to kill him, right? Does that mean you don't have a gold-plated toilet seat? What does it mean?

Again, I am not hearing any of these wealthy folks complain. I am hearing everybody complain in their name, but I don't hear any of them complain. Let me tell you, I have been doing this a long time. Few times have I ever stood on the floor, with CNN watching, saying if there is anybody who is making over \$400,000 a year who is not willing to pay \$2,100 more to win the war, call me. No one is calling me. I don't get this.

I don't think these folks who will be affected by this tax change will begrudge one nickel of this \$87 billion. So I say to my colleagues, if we don't do this now, pay for this installment in the war now, taking a small part of the tax cut, when we have a national security emergency supplemental request from the President, when the deficit is skyrocketing to over half a trillion dollars a year, are there no circumstances ever when it will be right to reconsider less than 5 percent of the biggest tax cut in history?

My time is almost up. It seems to me we are at a place where responsibility dictates that we be rational and not ideological, we pay now instead of just putting this on the tab for the pages on the Senate floor, that we don't ask our children to pay for our security, and we pay for our security and our children's security.

This, to me, is the most inexplicable opposition to anything I have ever been involved with on the floor of the Senate.

I believe my time has expired. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Biden-Kerry amendment. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, for the reasons previously stated on this side, I move to table Senator BIDEN's

amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 373 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Miller
Allen	Domenici	Murkowski
Baucus	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Enzi	Nickles
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Pryor
Bond	Frist	Roberts
Breaux	Graham (SC)	Santorum
Brownback	Grassley	Sessions
Bunning	Gregg	Shelby
Burns	Hagel	Smith
Campbell	Hatch	Snowe
Chambliss	Hutchison	Specter
Cochran	Inhofe	Stevens
Coleman	Kyl	Sununu
Collins	Lincoln	Talent
Cornyn	Lott	Thomas
Craig	Lugar	Voinovich
Crapo	McCain	Warner

NAYS—42

Akaka	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Biden	Durbin	Leahy
Bingaman	Edwards	Levin
Boxer	Feingold	Lieberman
Byrd	Feinstein	Mikulski
Cantwell	Harkin	Murray
Carper	Hollings	Nelson (FL)
Chafee	Inouye	Reed
Clinton	Jeffords	Reid
Conrad	Johnson	Rockefeller
Corzine	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Schumer
Dayton	Kohl	Stabenow
Dodd	Landrieu	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Graham (FL)

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1802

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. COLEMAN], for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CORZINE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. ALLEN proposes an amendment numbered 1802.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To fund travel within the United States for members of the Armed Forces on rest and recuperation leave from a deployment overseas in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom)

On page 22, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: